REMARKS

Claims 12, 23, and 30-33 have been cancelled. Claims 30-33 have been cancelled without traverse response to a previous restriction requirement for further prosecution in a divisional application. Claims 37-44 have been added. Claims 1-3, 6, 9-11, 13-15, 18, 21-22, 25-26, 28-29, 34-35, and 37-44 remain in the case for reconsideration. No new subject matter has been added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §112

Claims 1-3, 6, 9-12, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, because of language added to the preamble of claim 1. The previous amendments made to the preamble of claim 1 have been removed. Accordingly claims 1-3, 6, 9-11, 28, and 29 are allowable under 35 USC 112.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102 and 35 USC §102

Claims 1, 2, 11-14, 23-29, and 34-35 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by prior art of figures 1 and 2 as disclosed by Kao.

Claims 1, 2, 11-14, 23-29, and 34-35 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior Art (as provided in applicant's own specification and as shown in applicant's figures 1A-1B and herein referred to a "PA") in view of Kakizaki et al..

Claims 3, 6, 9, 10, 15, 18, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over prior art of figures 1 and 2 as disclosed by Kao in view of Rohee.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended and now recites:

a supporting surface pressing up against a platform of a scanner, the platform including a transparent sheet; and

an absorbing body located beneath the supporting surface, wherein at least a portion of the absorbing body is compressively deformable in a downward and laterally outward direction in response to an external force being exerted on the platform.

This is all clearly supported in the pending application at least in FIG. 5 where an external force F on platform 110 causes the support element 510 to move in both a downward and a laterally outward direction as also shown by the dashed lines.

Kao

Kao shows a spring 202 in FIG. 2, a spring 203 in FIG. 3, and a spring clip 2042 in FIG. 4. None of the springs 202, 203, or 2042 in Kao have a supporting surface pressing up against a platform of a scanner that includes a transparent plate as recited in claim 1. Conversely, the springs 202, 203, and 2040 in Kao are attached to a contact image sensor 21, supporting shaft 2031, or supporting shaft 2041, respectively.

Further, none of the springs 202, 203, or 2042 in Kao have an absorbing body located beneath the supporting surface, wherein at least a portion of the absorbing body is compressively deformable in a downward and laterally outward direction in response to an external force being exerted on the platform as also recited in claim 1.

The springs 202 in FIG. 2 of Kao only move in a downward compressed direction but not in a laterally outward direction. The springs 203 in FIG. 3 of Kao only move in a downward direction and are not compressed and do not move in a laterally outward direction upon receiving an external force on platform 16. The springs 2040 in FIG. 4 of Kao only move in a downward direction and are not compressed and do not move in a laterally outward direction upon receiving an external force from platform 16.

Rohee

Rohee discloses a slide for a vehicle seat. The vehicle seat apparatus described in Rohee is inappropriate to cite as prior art due to the unrelated field of art. Regardless, the dampener 10 in Rohee does not teach or suggest a supporting surface pressing up against a platform of a scanner as recited in claim 1. Conversely, the dampener 10 in Rohee is inserted between two U-shaped members 1 and 5.

The dampener 10 in Rohee also does not have an absorbing body located beneath the supporting surface, wherein at least a portion of the absorbing body is compressively deformable in a downward and laterally outward direction in response to an external force being exerted on the platform as recited in claim 1.

The two U-shaped members 1 and 5 in Rohee prevent the stem 10A from deforming in a downward and laterally outward direction in response to an external force as recited in claim 1.

Kakizaki

Kakizaki describes a spacer 17 that has a top end 17A that supports a housing 18 and a bottom end 17D that sits on a bottom housing 20. A circuit board 16 is inserted between the top end 17A and bottom end 17D.

The top end 17A of the spacer 17 in Kakizaki does not press up against a platform of a scanner as recited in claim 1. The spacer 17 in Kakizaki also does having an absorbing body that compresses both a downward and a laterally outward direction in response to receiving an external force on the platform as recited in claim 1. If an external force were applied in Kakizaki, the upper portion 17A would most likely move slightly downward but would not move laterally outward as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly claim 1 is patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over the prior art shown in applicant's figures 1A-1B, in view of Kao, Rohee or Kakizaki. Claims 15, 34, 40, and 43 include, inter alia, features similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1 and for at least this reason are also patentable over the cited references.

Claims 13

Claim 13 recites:

a support element integrally formed with the housing, the support element including:

a supporting surface contacting the platform of the scanner; and

an absorbing body located beneath the supporting surface, the absorbing body including an inclined beam that extends directly down from the supporting surface at an inclined angle with respect to the supporting surface and wherein the absorbing body is compressively deformable to vary the inclined angle of the inclined beam with respect to the supporting surface.

This is all clearly supported in the pending application at least in FIG. 5 where a supporting surface 512 presses up against platform 110 and an inclined beam 516 extends directly down from the supporting surface 512. FIG. 5 also shows that upon receiving a force F on platform 110 the inclined angle of the beam 516 changes as shown by the dashed lines.

Kao

None of the springs 202, 203, or 2042 in Kao have a supporting surface contacting the platform of the scanner an absorbing body located beneath the supporting surface and having an inclined beam that extends directly down from the supporting surface at an inclined angle,

the inclined beam having a resilient deformation where an external stress received by the supporting surface in response to an external force on the platform varies the inclined angle of the beam as recited in claim 13. As described above, the springs in Kao never come in contact with any scanner platform.

Rohee

The dampener 10 in Rohee does not teach or suggest an absorbing body including an inclined beam that extends directly down from the supporting surface at an inclined angle with respect to the supporting surface and wherein the absorbing body is compressively deformable to vary the inclined angle of the inclined beam with respect to the supporting surface as recited in claim 13.

The stem 10A shown in FIG. 1 of Rohee is vertical and does not extend down from a top crossbar 10B at an inclined angle as recited in claim 1. The two U-shaped members 1 and 5 in Rohee prevent the stem 10A from varying at any inclined angle when a force is applied as recited in claim 1.

Kakizaki

The top end 17A of the spacer 17 in Kakizaki does not press up against a platform of a scanner as recited in claim 1. The spacer 17 in Kakizaki also does not have an inclined beam that extends directly down from the supporting surface at an inclined angle. Conversely, Kakizaki has a vertical side wall that connects and extends perpendicularly from both the top end 17A and the bottom end 17D.

Accordingly claim 13 is also patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over the Prior Art shown in applicant's figures 1A-1B, in view of Kao, Rohee or Kakizaki. Claims 11, 34, 40, and 44 include, inter alia, features similar to those discussed above with reference to claim13 and for at least this reason are also patentable over the cited references.

Claim 34

Claim 34 recites *means for resiliently and compressively deforming to absorb an external stress received by the means for supporting a platform of the scanner, wherein the means for resiliently and compressively deforming to absorb an external stress varies an inclined angle of an inclined beam while deforming in both a downward direction and a laterally outward direction.*

This combination of varying an inclined angle of an inclined beam while deforming in both a downward direction and a laterally outward direction is clearly shown in the specification and figures as explained above with respect to claims 1 and 13.

For the same reasons explained above with respect to claims 1 and 13, neither Kao, Rohee or Kakizaki suggest a supporting structure that deforms to absorb an external stress by varying an inclined angle of an inclined beam while deforming in both a downward direction and a laterally outward direction.

Accordingly claim 34 is also patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over the Prior Art shown in applicant's figures 1A-1B, in view of Kao, Rohee or Kakizaki.

Claim 2

Claim 2 has been amended and recites: *wherein the supporting surface and absorbing body are located against a side of a scanner housing.* This is clearly supported by FIGS. 2A and 2B of the pending application.

The springs 202, 203, or 2042 is Kao are located on or underneath the support 201 and are not located against a side of a scanner housing as recited in claim 2.

The damper 10 in Rohee is located in-between two U-shaped elements 1 and 5 and therefore is also not located against a side of a scanner housing as recited in claim 2.

The spacer 17 in Kakizaki is spaced away from the upper housing 18 and therefore is not located against a side of a scanner housing as recited in claim 2.

The art cited in FIGS. 1A and 2B of applicant's pending application shows block members 112 located against a side wall of a lower housing 102. However, these block members 112 are not compressible at all, not to mention compressible in a downward and outward direction as recited in claim 1.

Locating a downward and outward compressible support structure against the side of the housing is unique and novel because lateral stability is provided by the enclosure side while the compressible support structure is still able to compress both downward and outward.

Accordingly, claim 2 is allowable under both 35 USC 102(e) and 35 USC 103(a).

Claim 3

Claim 3 recites a bottom surface pressing down against a bottom surface of a scanner housing wherein the supporting surface, absorbing body, and the bottom surface are all integrally formed together as a unitary structure.

Neither Kao, Rohee, or Kakizaki disclose an integrally formed unitary structure having a top surface pressing up against a scanning platform including a transparent plate, and a bottom surface pressing down against a bottom surface of a scanner housing.

As described above, the springs 202, 203, or 2042 in Kao connect at one end to a CIS 31 or to a shaft 2041 and connect at a second end either to a holder 210 or 301. The dampener 10 in Rohee is inserted between two U-shaped members 1 and 5 and the spacer 17 in Kakizaki sits between an upper enclosure 18 and a lower enclosure 20.

Accordingly, claim 3 is also allowable under 35 USC 103(a) over the cited prior art in light of Kao, Rohee, or Kakizaki.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 3, 6, 9-15, 18, 21-26 and 28-35 of the application as amended is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 224-2170 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP

Stephen S. Ford
Reg. No. 35,139

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP
621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600
Portland, Oregon 97205

Customer No. 73552